

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:20-cr-82-5

vs.

GLENN SEWELL,

District Judge Michael J. Newman

Defendant.

ORDER: (1) DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTIONS TO APPOINT COUNSEL (DOC. NOS. 218, 223); AND (2) REQUIRING DEFENDANT’S COUNSEL TO MEET AND CONFER WITH DEFENDANTS ON OR BEFORE 9/19/2022 TO DETERMINE IF COUNSEL SHOULD FILE, ON DEFENDANT’S BEHALF, A MOTION TO APPOINT DEFENDANT A FOURTH CJA COUNSEL

This criminal case is before the Court upon Defendant Glenn Sewell’s two *pro se* letters, which the Court liberally construes in his favor as motions to appoint new counsel. Doc. Nos. 218, 223; *see Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976) (noting, “handwritten *pro se* document is to be liberally construed”). Although Defendant is currently represented by well-qualified and skilled counsel, he no longer wants his current counsel to represent him. Yet his motions fail to demonstrate the existence of good cause to appoint new counsel to represent Defendant. *United States v. Iles*, 906 F.2d 1122, 1130 (6th Cir. 1990) (“The right to counsel of *choice*, unlike the *right* to counsel..., is not absolute. An indigent defendant has no right to have a particular attorney represent him and therefore must demonstrate ‘good cause’ to warrant substitution of counsel”). The Court therefore (1) **DENIES** Defendant’s motions to appoint counsel (Doc. Nos. 218, 223); and (2) **REQUIRES** Defendant’s counsel to meet and confer with Defendant **on or before**

September 19, 2022 to determine if counsel should file, on Defendant's behalf, a motion to appoint Defendant a fourth CJA counsel.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

August 29, 2022

s/Michael J. Newman
Hon. Michael J. Newman
United States District Judge